UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/519,999	03/06/2000	Shigeo Ozawa	4495-001	8766

7590 01/16/2004

Lowe Hauptman Gopstein Gilman & Berner LLP
1700 Diagonal Road
Suite 310
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
MADSEN, ROBERT A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1761	

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/519,999	OZAWA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert Madsen	1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 October 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *10,11,13-18,20-25 and 29-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *10,11,13-18,20-25,29-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment filed October 27,2003 has been entered. Claims 30-33 have been added. Claims 10,11,13-18,20-25,29-33 are pending in the application.

2. The amendment to claims 1, 20, and 22 do not change the scope of the claims. Examiner understands claims 1 and 22 to mean the outer bag has 1 vapor releasing hole, which is the second vapor releasing hole for "a container" , wherein 1 vapor releasing hole is in the first inner bag and 1 vapor releasing hole is in the outer bag.

3. The rejection of claim 10,11, 13-15,18 made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooyama (JP 03-136614) in view of Hoffman (US 3683889) stands and has been copied into this office action.

4. The rejection of claim 27 made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooyama (JP 03-136614) in view of Hoffman (US 3683889), , further in view of Chung (US 5741534) stands and has been copied into this office action.

5. The rejection of 20, and 22-25 made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooyama (JP 03-136614) stands and has been copied into this office action.

6. The rejection of claim 21 made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooyama (JP 03-136614), further in view of Hoffman (US 3683889) stands and has been copied into this office action.

7. The rejection of claim 29 made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooyama (JP 03-136614) in view of Hoffman (US 3683889) further in view of Chung (US 5741534) stands and has been copied into this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

10. Regarding claims 31 and 33, applicant's specification does not disclose a "submergence" of a second inner bag with *vapor*. The specification includes passing hot water (i.e. paragraph 12) onto the second inner bag, but not "submerging" the bag in vapor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

12. Claims 20, 22-25, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooyama (JP 03-136614).

13. Regarding claims 20,22,23,25 Ooyama teaches an outer bag having a vapor releasing hole (i.e. bag 11 with steam pressure releasing vent 21) at the top of the bag, as recited in claim 22, and a selective liquid releasing hole (i.e. hot water draining

opening 23) at the bottom of the bag as recited in claim 23, a first inner bag in the outer bag filled with liquid (i.e. water bag 12) with a liquid release hole(i.e. hot water draining opening 31) for releasing the water when heated, a second permeable inner bag (food/drink container bag item 13),containing a food or drink ingredient as recited in claim 25, for mixing with the discharged liquid from the first bag(English Translation Page 9, line 4 to Page 10, line 9and Figures). Ooyama further teaches the liquid release hole (i.e. hot water draining opening item 31) of the first inner bag *may* be substituted with a steam pressure release hole for steaming products (Page 14, lines 1-10), which Ooyama defines as the upper part of a bag, as recited in claim 20, when discussing the outer bag (Page 4, line 11 to Page 5, line 7). Ooyama is silent in using a *second* inner bag *in combination* with a first inner bag having the vapor release hole, as recited in claim 20.

14. However, Ooyama teaches two different forms of food separating means (i.e. from the first inner bag) and two different food heating/cooking mediums discharged from the first inner bag. Ooyama uses a partition sheet to separate the food from the first inner bag having a vapor release hole, and the sheet is made from the same material of that Ooyama uses to form second inner bags to separate the food from the first inner bag (i.e. thin –yarn net or unwoven cloth made of a synthetic resin on Page 8, lines 7-11 and Page 10, lines 19-23). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Ooyama and substitute a second inner bag for the partition sheet since one would have been substituting one separating means for another for the same purpose: placing a permeable separating means between a food/drink ingredient and a first liquid –

containing bag (all placed within an outer bag) so that the contents of the first liquid containing bag may permeate the separating means and cook/heat the food/drink ingredient. Additionally, Ooyama does teach that one may cook a food item using *either* a liquid release hole or vapor release hole (Page 14, lines 1-10). Therefore, to modify Ooyama, where a second inner bag contains the food/drink ingredient, and include a vapor release hole in the first inner bag would have been an obvious result effective variable of the particular cooking medium desired (i.e. steam or boiled liquid), since Ooyama teaches using either liquid or vapor to heat the food/drink ingredients.

15. Regarding claim 24, Ooyama teaches the second inner bag may be attached to the bottom of the outer bag (Page 8, lines 23 and 24).

16. Regarding claim 32, as discussed in the rejection of claims 20,22,23,25 Ooyama teaches the second inner bag vapor release hole below the food component. Additionally, Ooyama teaches the second seal of the outer bag s released at a given pressure (Page 5, lines 21-24) and temperature (95-100°C in the example) to effectively steam/season the food for a particular time (1 minute 45 seconds in the example) without causing textural problems (example from Page 12 line 4 to Page 13, line 24 and Page 14 lines 1-24). Therefore, to position the food component such that a portion of the food component bag is below the vapor release hole, would have been an obvious result effective variable of (1) the particular (i.e. how much steam is required to heat the food) and (2) the pressure/time at which the *outer* bag vapor hole opens. Ooyama positions the food above the vapor release hole, presumably, so that all of the steam contacts the food before being released from the outer bag. If a portion of the food bag,

or specifically the food, were located beneath the vapor hole of the second inner bag, a portion of food may not be exposed to the same amount of steam, and Ooyama teaches adjusting the vapor release of the outer bag such that the food may completely cooked the food.

17. Claim 21 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooyama (JP 03-136614) as applied to claims 20,22-25 above, further in view of Hoffman (US 3683889).

18. Regarding claim 21, Ooyama heats the outer/inner bags by external heat source and is silent in teaching providing an internal heating element in the first inner bag.

19. Hoffman is relied on as evidence of the conventionality of providing an internal heating element in the liquid holding portion of a container(including a bag) wherein the purpose of the bag is to heat the liquid to penetrate an interior bag containing a solid. Hoffman teaches the providing an internal heat source for these types of products is conventional and offers the advantage of an economical way of preparing these products without an external source of heat. (Abstract, Column 1 lines 1-63, Column 2, lines 10-24, Column 4, line 44 to Column 5, line 39). Therefore it would have been obvious to include an internal heating element in the liquid containing bag of Ooyama since it was known in the art to provide this type of heat source within a liquid compartment such that the liquid is heated to hydrate a solid in a separate permeable compartment in order to eliminate the need for an external heat source and make a more economical package. One would have been substituting one heating means for another for the same purpose.

20. Regarding claim 33, Ooyama teaches the second inner bag may be bonded to the bottom of the bag (Page 8, Paragraph 5). As discussed above in the rejection of 20, 22-25, and 32, Ooyama teaches the heat supplied to the container generates enough heat to cause the liquid to escape as a vapor to cook the food and that the contents of the liquid bag will remain in the outer bag for a sufficient period of time for cooking. Thus, the food must be "submerged" in the vapor, otherwise the food would not cook.

21. Claims 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooyama (JP 03-136614) in view of Hoffman (US 3683889), as applied to claims 20,22-25 above, further in view of further in view of Chung (US 5741534).

22. Although Ooyama teaches combining a two food components such as soup in the first interior bag and fish in the second inner bag, Ooyama is silent in teaching any additional second inner bags disposed around the first inner bag.

23. Chung also teaches preparing multi-component food products wherein the liquid seasoning component is package separately from the food component prior heating (Column 1, line8-column 2, line 7, Column 4, lines 13-32) and is relied on as evidence of the conventionality of separately packaging more than two food components (e.g. rice and vegetables) in addition to the liquid seasoning component (e.g. gravy). Therefore, to further add any additional second inner bags to the outer bag of Ooyama would have been an obvious matter of choice depending on the recipe since it was known to prepare multi-component food products wherein one component comprises a liquid

seasoning and one or more additional components comprise separately packaged food products intended to be flavored by the liquid component.

24. Claims 10,11, 13-15,18,30,31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooyama (JP 03-136614) in view of Hoffman (US 3683889).

25. Regarding claims 10,11,13,18,Ooyama teaches an outer bag having a vapor releasing hole (i.e. bag 11 with steam pressure releasing vent 21) and a selective liquid releasing hole (i.e. hot water draining opening 23), a first inner bag in the outer bag that is filled with liquid (i.e. water bag 12) and has a liquid release hole (i.e. hot water draining opening 31) for releasing the water when heated, a second permeable inner bag (food/drink container bag item 13) containing fish or tea, as recited in claim 11, for mixing with the discharged liquid from the first bag, and thus the water must be edible as recited in claim 13 (English Translation Page 9, line 4 to Page 10, line 9 and Figures). Furthermore, in the explanation (i.e. example from Page 12 line 4 to Page 14, line 16), Ooyama further teaches the liquid release hole (i.e. hot water draining opening item 31) of the first inner bag *may* be substituted with a steam pressure release hole for steaming products (Page 14, lines 1-10), which Ooyama defines as the upper part of a bag, as recited in claim 10, when discussing the outer bag (Page 4, line 11 to Page 5, line 7). However, Ooyama is silent in using a *second* inner bag in combination with a first inner bag having the vapor release hole as recited in claim 10, providing an *internal* heating element in the first inner bag as recited in claim 10 , wherein the heating

element comprises at least two separately stored chemicals that react upon application of force as recited in claim 18.

26. With respect to Ooyama being silent in using a *second* inner bag in combination with a first inner bag having the vapor release hole, Ooyama teaches two different forms of food separating means (i.e. from the first inner bag) and two different food heating/cooking mediums discharged from the first inner bag. Ooyama uses a partition sheet to separate the food from the first inner bag having a vapor release hole, and the sheet is made from the same material of that Ooyama uses to form second inner bags to separate the food from the first inner bag (i.e. thin –yarn net or unwoven cloth made of a synthetic resin on Page 8, lines 7-11 and Page 10, lines 19-23). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Ooyama and substitute a second inner bag for the partition sheet since one would have been substituting one separating means for another for the same purpose: placing a permeable separating means between a food/drink ingredient and a first liquid –containing bag (all placed within an outer bag) so that the contents of the first liquid containing bag may permeate the separating means and cook/heat the food/drink ingredient. Additionally, Ooyama does teach that one may cook a food item using *either* a liquid release hole or vapor release hole (Page 14, lines 1-10). Therefore, to modify Ooyama, where a second inner bag contains the food/drink ingredient, and include a vapor release hole in the first inner bag would have been an obvious result effective variable of the particular cooking medium desired (i.e. steam or boiled liquid), since Ooyama teaches using either liquid or vapor to heat the food/drink ingredients.

27. With respect to providing an internal heating element in the first inner bag as recited in claim 10, wherein the heating element comprises at least two separately stored chemicals that react upon application of force as recited in claim 18, Ooyama teaches external heating of the first inner bag. However, Hoffman is relied on as evidence of the conventionality of providing an internal heating element in the liquid holding portion of a container (including a bag) wherein the purpose of the bag is to heat the liquid to penetrate an interior bag containing a solid. Hoffman teaches the providing an internal heat source for these types of products is conventional and offers the advantage of an economical way of preparing these products without an external source of heat. Hoffman further teaches the element comprises two separate chemicals that react upon applying force to heat the container, as recited in claim 18 (Abstract, Column 1 lines 1-63, Column 2, lines 10-24, Column 4, line 44 to Column 5, line 39). Therefore it would have been obvious to include an internal heating element in the liquid containing bag of Ooyama wherein at least two separated chemicals react as a result of external force since it was known in the art to provide this type of heat source within a liquid compartment such that the liquid is heated to hydrate a solid in a separate permeable compartment in order to eliminate the need for an external heat source and make a more economical package. One would have been substituting one heating means for another for the same purpose.

28. Regarding claim 14, the second inner bag (food/drink container bag 13) is attached to the bottom surface of the outer bag (Page 8, lines 23 and 24).

29. Regarding claims 15, Ooyama teaches the second seal is released at a given pressure (Page 5, lines 21-24) and temperature (95-100°C in the example) to effectively steam/season the food for a particular time (1 minute 45 seconds in the example) without causing textural problems (example from Page 12 line 4 to Page 13, line 24 and Page 14 lines 1-24). Since the second seal is released at a particular pressure/temperature, Ooyama teaches the second seal of the bag is time adjustable. For example, a higher designated pressure for the second seal would result in a *longer* cooking time. Additionally, any particular designated pressure/temperature would depend on the amount of heat applied (i.e. a lower heat source temperature would require a longer time to reach the release pressure than a higher heat source temperature).

30. Regarding claim 30, as discussed in the rejection of claims 10,11,13,15,18, Ooyama teaches the second inner bag vapor release hole below the food component, and that the vapor release seal for the outer bag is designed to provided sufficient cooking. Therefore, to position the food component such that a portion of the food component bag is below the vapor release hole, would have been an obvious result effective variable of (1) the particular (i.e. how much steam is required to heat the food) and (2) the pressure/time at which the *outer* bag vapor hole opens. The purpose of this embodiment is for steaming the food component and Ooyama positions the food above the vapor release hole, presumably, so that all of the steam contacts the food before being released from the outer bag. If a portion of the food bag, or specifically the food, were located beneath the vapor hole of the second inner bag, a portion food may not be

exposed to the same amount of steam, but the food may still be fully cooked if the steam is maintained in the outer bag for period sufficient to completely cook the food.

31. Regarding claim 31, Ooyama teaches the second inner bag may be bonded to the bottom of the bag (Page 8, Paragraph 5). As discussed above in the rejection of 0,11,13,15,18, Ooyama teaches the heat supplied to the container generates enough heat to cause the liquid to escape as a vapor to cook the food and that the contents of the liquid bag will remain in the outer bag for a sufficient period of time for cooking. Thus, the food must be "submerged" in the vapor, otherwise the food would not cook.

32. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooyama (JP 03-136614) in view of Hoffman (US 3683889), as applied to claims 10,11, 13-15,18 above, further in view of Yoshio et al. (JP06329179).

33. Ooyama is silent in teaching, an indicator for displaying the time when the closure is open as recited in claim 16 and a pressure indicator as recited in claim 17.

34. Yoshio et al. ('179) also teach a second seal for an outer bag to maintain uniform pressure during cooking to assure a flavor (See item 24 in Drawing 16 in light of the Abstract, Paragraphs 0036-0038,0044-0046). Yoshio et al. ('179) are relied on as evidence of the conventionality of providing an " indicator for displaying the time when the seal is open" since Yoshio et al. ('179) teach the seal lifts up and away from the bag when the desired pressure is reached, thus indicating time when the seal is open. Furthermore, by lifting away from the bag, the closure serves as a pressure indicator, or indicates pressure has exceeded the designated pressure (Drawings, Paragraphs 0036-0038,0044-0046). Therefore, it would have been further obvious to include a

second closure that provides an indicator for displaying the time when the seal is open, as recited in claim 16, since one would have been substituting one type of second seal for another for the same purpose: maintaining uniform pressure during cooking to assure the desired flavor for a desired time. It also would have been to provide a second seal that provides a pressure indicator, as recited in claim 17, since this would signify when an excessive pressure has been reached and one would have substituting one type of second seal for another for the same purpose: maintaining uniform pressure during cooking to assure the desired flavor for a desired time.

35. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooyama (JP 03-136614) in view of Hoffman (US 3683889), as applied to claims 10,11, 13-15,18 above, further in view of Chung (US 5741534).

36. Although Ooyama teaches combining a two food components such as soup in the first interior bag and fish in the second inner bag, Ooyama is silent in teaching any additional second inner bags disposed around the first inner bag.

37. Chung also teaches preparing multi-component food products wherein the liquid seasoning component is package separately from the food component prior heating (Column 1, line8-column 2, line 7, Column 4, lines 13-32) and is relied on as evidence of the conventionality of separately packaging more than two food components (e.g. rice and vegetables) in addition to the liquid seasoning component (e.g. gravy). Therefore, to further add any additional second inner bags to the outer bag of Ooyama would have been an obvious matter of choice depending on the recipe since it was known to prepare multi-component food products wherein one component comprises a liquid

seasoning and one or more additional components comprise separately packaged food products intended to be flavored by the liquid component.

Response to Arguments

38. Applicant's arguments filed October 27,2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

39. Applicant argues that Ooyama does not teach how the steam pressure releasing vent is formed for the first inner or liquid containing bag, and that the liquid is released from the bag to generate sufficient steam to heat the food. However, it is noted that Ooyama uses "steam pressure releasing vent" to describe a hole at the top of the outer bag for releasing steam and a "hot water draining opening" for the bottom of the outer bag to release water(see Page 16), and both the vent and opening respond to an increase in pressure (e.g. The example on Page 9). Thus, based on the terminology set forth by Ooyama , "steam pressure releasing vent" must be at the top of the first inner bag for releasing vapor. This conclusion is further supported by Ooyama teaching that "If it is desired for the liquid inside the liquid container bag to flow out at a given steam pressure, the pack may be constructed in such a way that the bag itself explodes" subsequent to disclosing the use of a "steam pressure releasing vent" (Page 14).

40. Applicant further argues that Ooyama fails to disclose that the food-containing bag is bonded to the bottom of the outer bag *in combination* with the steaming as recited in claim 24. However, Ooyama teaches the food bag may be bonded to the bottom of the bag, and as stated in the rejection of claim 20 and in the preceding paragraph, Ooyama teaches that the first inner bag may release either liquid or steam.

41. With respect to the arguments addressing the combination of Ooyama and Hoffman, Hoffman teaches a heating element to be supplied in a bag of liquid for heating the liquid that subsequently contacts a separately contained solid food substance, such as coffee or tea, wherein the purpose of the heating element is to eliminate the need for an external heating source (See Column 2, lines 23-24 in light of Column 4, line 44 to Column 5, line 39, wherein the cavity 16 holds the liquid to be heated). Ooyama teaches heating a liquid containing bag with an external heating source so that the heated liquid may be combined with separately contained coffee or tea. Thus, the motivation for combining Hoffman with Ooyama is that Hoffman teaches an improvement on the liquid bag of Ooyama and the elimination of an external heating source.

42. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the Chung with Ooyama, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, while Ooyama only teaches one food bag and on liquid seasoning bag, Chung provides motivation to add more than two food components (e.g. rice and vegetables) in addition to the liquid seasoning component (e.g. gravy) in a given recipe, when the liquid

seasoning component is package separately from the food component prior heating (Column 1, line8-column 2, line 7, Column 4, lines 13-32).

43. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 30-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

44. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

45. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

46. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Madsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1402. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-3:30PM M-F.

47. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

48. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0061.

Robert Madsen
Examiner
Art Unit 1761

STEVE WEXLER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
1761
1/12/04